



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,223	08/29/2001	Mchmet Sayal	10010316-1	8853

7590 11/16/2007
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

KHATRI, ANIL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2191

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/16/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/943,223

Applicant(s)

SAYAL ET AL.

Examiner

Anil Khatri

Art Unit

2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “A Common Object Model Discussion Paper”, Document number WfMC-TC-1022, pp 1-16, 1998 (hereinafter *ACOMDP*) in view of *Anderson et al*, “Workflow Interoperability Enabling E Commerce”, April 1, pp 1-11, 1999, www.wfmc.org.

Regarding claims 1, 11 and 17

ACOMDP teaches,

- receiving a description of a business-to-business interaction standard (page 9 item 3.2, Internet centric workflow: (2) “the ability to transfer a business process...transferred during process enactment”);
- converting the description of business-to-business interaction standard to a structured representation of the business-to-business interaction standard (page 4, item 2. Current architecture: 2nd paragraph, “ A standardized API model (WAPI) is provided for communication between software application and the workflow...distributed platforms). *ACOMDP doesn't teach explicitly* automatically generating at least one process template

Art Unit: 2191

based on the structured representation of the business-to-business interaction standard; and using the process template to design a workflow. However, *Anderson et al* teaches automatically generating at least one process template based on the structured representation of the business-to-business interaction standard (page 7, 3rd paragraph Assessing Interoperability: “The WfMC interoperability standard are design to allow user of...workflow engines); and

using the process template to design a workflow (page 3, 3rd paragraph, “Each new process that is started on a workflow... given process instance). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate B2B interaction in workflow model. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine teaching into developing or creating a workflow model from existing model to interact in business-to-business environment to provide commonality to different vendor a common platform to perform business activities.

Regarding claims 2 and 13

Anderson et al teaches,

the description of an electronic business- to-business interaction standard includes a description of one of RosettaNet, CBL, EDI, OSI, and cXML (page 2, 1st paragraph, line 2, EDI has provided a reliable messaging...in operation).

Art Unit: 2191

Regarding claims 3 and 14

Anderson et al teaches,

for each state, defining all income transitions and all outgoing transitions (page 3, figure 1, 1st paragraph, “the following is supply chain scenario...); and

for each transition, defining a source state and a target state (page 3, figure 1 and page 4, figure 2, last paragraph, “the manufacture and transport...).

Regarding claims 4 and 15

ACOMDP teaches,

Representing data in a standard form by employing a mark up language (page 9, item 3.2, (2) line 9, “note tat XML may also have a role to play in this area”, page 11, top portion, see diagram with common object mode interacting with different programming language including C++, VB etc.).

Regarding claim 5

ACOMDP teaches,

the structured process definition includes structured data and structured data flow (page 12, see figure, 2nd paragraph, “an above representation of a workflow...history object).

Regarding claims 6 and 16

ACOMDP teaches,

the structured process definition includes an XMI that includes at least one XML document (page 9, item 3.2, (2) line 9, “note tat XML may also have a role to play in this area”, page 11,

Art Unit: 2191

top portion, see diagram with common object mode interacting with different programming language including C++, VB etc.).

Regarding claim 7

Anderson et al teaches,

automatically converting the structured data and flow into at least one process template that is specific to a particular workflow management system (automatically generating at least one process template based on the structured representation of the business-to-business interaction standard (page 7, 3rd paragraph Assessing Interoperability: “The WfMC interoperability standard are design to allow user of...workflow engines).

Regarding claim 8

ACOMDP teaches,

storing the process templates into a process template repository; wherein the process templates are accessible to a workflow designer (page 13, see figure, page 15, see figure, item 5.2, The process definition is...meta-model”); and

storing the service templates into a service template repository; wherein the service templates are accessible to a workflow designer (page 13, see figure, item 5.2, The process definition is...workflow behavior”).

Art Unit: 2191

Regarding claim 9

ACOMDP teaches,

retrieving a process template from the process template repository (page 13, see figure, page 15

see figure, item 5.2, The process definition is...meta-model"); and

adding at least one local service to the process template (page 4, item 2.4: "to support interaction between...organizations).

Regarding claim 10

ACOMDP teaches,

designing a process that includes a plurality of local services (page 4, item 2.1.1: "current

standards are based upon...and page 5, domains such that they can...); and

adding at least one interaction point service to the process (page 5, 1st paragraph, "this approach greatly simplifies the coordination...upon this model).

Regarding claim 12

Anderson et al teaches,

automatically extracting a plurality of business-to-business (B2B) interaction points (page 7, 3rd

paragraph Assessing Interoperability: "The WfMC interoperability standard are design to allow user of...workflow engines); and

generating a business-to-business (B2B) service template for each extracted interaction point (page 8, last paragraph, "in the example given below...).

Art Unit: 2191

Regarding claim 18

ACOMDP teaches,


A service template repository o for storing business-to-business service template (page 15, see figure, 1st paragraph, various detailed component methods can... above model).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anil Khatri whose telephone number is 571-272-3725. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER